

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION

FILED BY *JE* D.C.

05 SEP 15 PM 2:37

THOMAS A. SCULL
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
W.D. OF TN, MEMPHIS

LOU HENRY M. LOCKETT III,

Plaintiff,

vs.

No. 05-2100-B/P

ACTION ORNAMENTAL IRON,

Defendant.

ORDER DENYING APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

At the time he commenced this action on February 4, 2005, plaintiff Lou Henry M. Lockett III filed a motion seeking appointment of counsel. Two statutes authorize the district court to request or appoint counsel for an indigent Title VII plaintiff. Twenty-eight U.S.C. § 1915(d) provides that the "court may request an attorney to represent any such person unable to employ counsel."¹ Similarly, under 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(f)(1), "upon application by the complainant and in such circumstances as the court may deem just, the court may appoint an attorney." However, "[t]here is no constitutional or . . . statutory right to counsel in federal civil cases." Farmer v. Haas, 990 F.2d 319, 323 (7th Cir. 1993). Generally, a court will only appoint counsel in exceptional circumstances. Willett v. Wells, 469 F. Supp. 748, 751 (E.D. Tenn. 1977). Although "no comprehensive definition of


¹ However, "§ 1915(d) does not authorize the federal courts to make coercive appointments of counsel" to represent indigent civil litigants. Mallard v. United States Dist. Court, 490 U.S. 296, 310 (1989).

13

exceptional circumstances is practical," Branch v. Cole, 686 F.2d 264, 266 (5th Cir. 1982), courts resolve this issue through a fact-specific inquiry. Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986). Examining the pleadings and documents in the file, the Court analyzes the merits of the claims, the complexity of the case, the pro se litigant's prior efforts to retain counsel, and her ability to present the claims. Henry v. City of Detroit Manpower Dep't, 763 F.2d 757, 760 (6th Cir. 1985); Wiggins v. Sargent, 753 F.2d 663, 668 (8th Cir. 1985).

As a general rule, counsel should be appointed in civil cases only if a litigant has made "a threshold showing of some likelihood of merit." Cooper v. A. Sargenti Co., 877 F.2d 170, 174 (2d Cir. 1989).² At this stage of the proceedings, before the Court has had the opportunity to assess the strength of plaintiff's case, the Court is unable to conclude that plaintiff has satisfied that standard. Moreover, a review of this complaint indicates that the case is not so complex that the Court should exercise its discretion to appoint counsel. Accordingly, the motion for appointment of counsel is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 15th day of September, 2005.



J. DANIEL BREEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

² The Second Circuit elaborated: "Courts do not perform a useful service if they appoint a volunteer lawyer to a case which a private lawyer would not take if it were brought to his or her attention. Nor do courts perform a socially justified function when they request the services of a volunteer lawyer for a meritless case that no lawyer would take were the plaintiff not indigent." Id.



Notice of Distribution

This notice confirms a copy of the document docketed as number 13 in case 2:05-CV-02100 was distributed by fax, mail, or direct printing on September 16, 2005 to the parties listed.

Don Owens
OWENS LAW FIRM
214 Adams Avenue
Memphis, TN 38103

Lou Henry M. Lockett
2667 Margot St.
Memphis, TN 38118

Honorable J. Breen
US DISTRICT COURT